REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Description of Amendments

In this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 20, 22, 28, 29, 33, 35, 37, 40, and 45-47; and cancels claims 1, 26, and 48. As amended, claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 20-23, 28-47, 50-57 and 60 are pending.

No new matter is introduced by this Amendment,

Interview with Examiner Rampuria

Applicant is grateful to Examiner Rampuria for his grant of an interview. Applicant understands that since the Office Action is final, Examiner Rampuria is not obligated to grant an interview.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 20-23, 28-48, 50-57, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nickum* (U.S. Patent Publication 20010039195) in view of *Boesen* (United States Patent Application Publication 20010027121). The cancellation of claims 1, 26, and 48 renders their rejection moot. For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 20-23, 28-47, 50-57, and 60.

As Examiner Rampuria pointed out in the interview, Nickum and Boesen do not teach all features of independent claims 23 and 60. Specifically, Nickum and Boesen do not teach a sliding door of claim 23 that can conceal the cell phone and that can also slide open to allow the access to the cell phone when it is coupled to the PDA. And Nickum and Boesen do not teach claim 60's feature that the user can open a cover to access the keyboard of the wireless communication device through the opening of the personal digital assistant. Accordingly, independent claims 23 and 60 are patentable over the combination of Nickum and Boesen.

As Applicant discussed in the interview with Examiner Rampuria, each of independent claims 6, 29, 33, 35, 50, 52, 54, and 56 recites that the processing device is usable to place and receive a telephone call via the wireless communication device. As discussed by Applicant, this feature is not disclosed or taught by *Nickum*.

Application No. 10/804,857 Amendment dated October 10, 2009 Reply to Office action of April 10, 2009

Paragraph [0032] of Nickum states:

[0032] It will be readily seen that the interconnection between portable computer 12, cellular telephone 14, and pager 16 allow communication apparatus 10 to function as a total communications package, allowing connection to a network or the internet, allowing outgoing and incoming telephone transmissions, allowing the receipt of pages, allowing the transmission and receipt of facsimile messages with appropriate software for portable computer 12, and the like. The communication apparatus 10 is versatile enough to allow disconnection of one or more of its components for stand alone use. For example, if the user of the communication apparatus 10 wished to leave the location at which the user was, but did not wish to carry or transport the entire communication apparatus 10, the user could choose which components of the apparatus 10 he wished to carry. For a short absence, pager 16 may be the only component the user wishes to take. For certain instances. only the cellular telephone 14 may be desired. It is a simple matter to disconnect the individual component desired from the communication apparatus as a whole. In this way, the total communication apparatus 10 becomes even more versatile for everyday use.

However, this paragraph does not disclose or teach that the portable computer can be used to make and receive telephone calls via the cell phone. Instead, the paragraph merely mentions that the communication apparatus 10 as a whole can make outgoing and incoming telephone calls.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, independent claims 6, 29, 33, 35, 50, 52, 54, and 56 are patentable over the combination of *Nickum* and *Boesen*.

Additionally, Applicant's careful review of paragraph [0032] of *Nickum* does not show that this paragraph discloses the features of claims 30-32. Paragraph [0032] says nothing that can be remotely interpreted as disclosing: (1) the portable computer displays information related to the cell phone; (2) the portable computer displays information normally provided on a mobile phone display; or (3) the portable computer displays a remaining battery charge of the cell phone and a reception strength of the cell phone.

The dependent claims not specifically mentioned above all depend from the patentable independent claims and therefore are patentable for the same reasons that the independent claims are patentable. Application No. 10/804,857 Amendment dated October 10, 2009 Reply to Office action of April 10, 2009

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested. Applicant petitions for a three-month Extension of Time to effect a timely response, and please charge any necessary fees and deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 07-1850.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 10, 2009

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
One Maritime Plaza
Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94111
Facsimile (415) 934-9887
Telephone (415) 954-0241
szhu@ssd.com

/Song Zhu, Reg. No. 44,420/

Song Zhu, Ph.D. Attorney for Applicant Reg. No. 44,420